

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-11, 13-23, 26, 27 and 29-32 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 11, 14, 22, and 23 are amended to even further distinguish the claims over the cited references. Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 13, 15-21, 26 and 27 are amended for clarity and consistency with the amendments to the independent claims. Claims 2, 8 and 12 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 29-32 are added. Support for added claims 29-32 can be found, for example, on page 4, lines 16-24 and page 19, lines 22-24. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is requested.

**I. Examiner Interview**

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Aggarwal in the October 30, 2007 personal interview. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

**II. Rejection of Claims 1, 11, 12, 22 and 23**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 11, 12, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ito et al. (Ito), U.S. Patent No. 6,967,675 in view of Matsumoto et al. (Matsumoto), U.S. Patent No. 6,833,861. The rejection of canceled claim 12 is moot. The rejection of claims 1, 11, 22 and 23 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 22 and 23 are amended to incorporate some of the features of claims 2, 5 and 8. Claim 11 is amended to incorporate the features of canceled claim 12. As acknowledged on page 6 of the Office Action, the combination of Ito and Matsumoto fails to teach an identifying information generation device recited in canceled claim 2. Independent claims 1, 22 and 23 are amended to incorporate the features of claim 2. Therefore, these claims are patentable over the combination of Ito and Matsumoto.

With regard to independent claim 11, as tentatively agreed in the personal interview, the combination of Ito and Matsumoto does not disclose the features of amended claim 11. Specifically, the motion image feature disclosed in Ito is different from the claimed continuous photography in that the motion image file in Ito has only one thumbnail image, whereas the plurality of sets of still image data resulting from the claimed continuous photography have a plurality of sets of simplified image data, as recited in claim 11. Matsumoto fails to overcome the deficiency of Ito. Therefore, claim 11 is patentable over the combination of Ito and Matsumoto. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

### **III. Rejection of claims 2, 5-8, 13-16, 20 and 21**

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 5-8, 13-16, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ito in view of Matsumoto, and in further view of Tomat et al. (Tomat) U.S. Patent No. 6,784,925. The rejection of canceled claims 2 and 8 is moot. The rejection of claims 5-7, 13-16, 20 and 21 is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 14, 22 and 23 are amended to incorporate some of the features of claims 2, 5 and 8. As tentatively agreed during the interview, Tomat does not suggest or disclose an image data processing device that generates a command for processing at the external storage device of the basic image data and transmits the command with identifying information for individually correspondence between the basic image data and the simplified image data to the external storage device, as now recited in independent claims 1, 14, 22 and 23.

As discussed during the interview, Tomat discloses a system, as shown in Fig. 4, where all thumbnail image files and all full-resolution JPEG image files stored in camera 14 are downloaded to the computer system 1 to be processed in the computer system 1 (see col. 8, lines 13-16). These files are stored in the cache memory of computer system 1 and are

controlled by the port monitor (see col. 8, lines 33-39). Therefore, the thumbnail images that are displayed in viewing area 192 of Fig. 22 are based on images controlled by the port monitor. Thus, Tomat merely discloses processing for image data stored in the cache memory and does not disclose that camera 14 sends a command for processing at computer system 1. Thus, independent claims 1, 14, 22 and 23 also are patentable over the combination of Ito, Matsumoto and Tomat.

Additionally, as tentatively agreed during the interview, Tomat does not disclose or suggest that the command for processing at the external storage device of basic image data is transmitted to the external device, as recited in claim 5. The Office Action asserts that Fig. 28 discloses this feature. However, as discussed in the interview, Fig. 28 merely shows a warning just for processing in computer system 1.

Because claims 5-7, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20 and 21 incorporate the features of amended independent claims 1, 11 and 14, these claims are also patentable over the cited references for at least these reasons, as well as for the additional features these claims recite. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

#### **IV. Other Rejections**

The Office Action rejects claims 4 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ito in view of Matsumoto; rejects claims 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ito in view of Matsumoto, and in further view of Anderson, U.S. Patent No. 6,532,039; and rejects claims 10, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ito in view of Matsumoto, and in further view of Yamaguchi et al. (Yamaguchi), U.S. Patent No. 6,400,392. The rejections are respectfully traversed.


Because claims 4, 9, 10, 17, 19, 26 and 27 incorporate the features of independent claims 1, 11, 22 and 23, these claims also are patentable over the cited references for this reason as well as for the additional features that these claims recite. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino  
Registration No. 33,565

Justin T. Lingard  
Registration No. 61,276

MAC:JTL/amw

Attachment:  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: November 15, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---